

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 17 and 18 are added. Support for new claims 17 and 18 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 7, line 15 to page 8, line 9. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Grange (U.S. Patent No. 5,394,178). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Grange does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of independent claims 1 and 12. Grange does not teach or suggest (1) "a mounting base that is movable forward and backward between a maintenance position and a retraction position," and (2) "wherein the cap base moves toward the nozzle surface to move the cap to cover the nozzle surface when the mounting base is at the maintenance position ... the wiper base keeps the wiper in contact with the nozzle surface while the mounting base moves backward from the maintenance position toward the retraction position," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 12 (emphasis added).

The Office Action asserts that the chassis 12 of Grange corresponds to the claimed mounting base. However, the base 12 of Grange is stationary, and not movable (see col. 2, lines 44-49). The base is either integrally formed as a part of the chassis or is mounted on the chassis to form a stationary base. Rather, the carriage 16 of Grange is movable (see col. 4, lines 34-46 of Grange). Therefore, Grange does not teach or suggest a mounting base that is movable, as recited in independent claims 1 and 12.

Further, Grange also does not teach or suggest a maintenance position where (1) the caps cover the nozzle surface, and (2) the wiper is in contact with the nozzle surface, as recited in independent claims 1 and 12. In Fig. 2 of Grange, the wiper 18a contacts the print head 16a, but the caps 24a, 24b do not cover the print heads 16a, 16b (see Fig. 2 of Grange). Further, in the position shown in Fig. 3, the caps 24a, 24b cover the print heads 16a, 16b, but

the wiper 18a does not contact the print heads 16a (see Fig. 3). Therefore, Grange does not teach or suggest "the cap base moves toward the nozzle surface to move the cap to cover the nozzle surface when the mounting base is at the maintenance position [and] ... the wiper base keeps the wiper in contact with the nozzle surface while the mounting base moves backward from the maintenance position toward the retraction position," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 12 (emphasis added).

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Grange. Claims 2-11 and 13-16, which variously depend from independent claims 1 and 12, are also patentable for at least their dependency on independent claims 1 and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant thus respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. O'Neill  
Registration No. 27,075

Patrick T. Muffo  
Registration No. 60,342

JA0:PTM/hs

Date: March 6, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--